



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,744	08/18/2000	Brian F. Tack	IOWA:026US	7819

7590 07/13/2005  
Stephen M. Hash  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P  
Suite 2400  
600 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER

MINNIFIELD, NITA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1645

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

6052005

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed on November 26, 2004 and May 31, 2005 are not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The RSL is still incorrect. The current RSL (5/31/05) states that SEQ ID NO: 17 is a peptide of 12 residues, the RSL of 11/26/04 states the same. However, the originally filed RSL (8/18/00) states that SEQ ID NO: 17 is a peptide of 14 residues. Which is correct? Further, the current RSL (5/31/05) has 34 sequences yet all other previously filed RSLs have only 28 sequences. Applicants have not provided any comments regarding these 6 new sequences added to the current RSL. Is this new matter? Where is the support for these sequences in the originally filed specification? Although Applicants may be able to overcome the pending art rejections, the confusing status of the RSL does not afford the Examiner clear evidence that the claimed sequences were not disclosed in the prior art. Further, claim 47 lacks proper antecedent basis in the recitation of SEQ ID NO: 19. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

attached: Interview Summary Record of 5/9/05

  
N. M. MINNIFIELD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

N. M. Minnifield  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1645